DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 080 EA 002 676

AUTHOR	Kinsella, Bernard W.; And Others
TITLE	The Supervisor's Role in Negotiation: For the ASCD Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers.
INSTITUTION	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	31p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Stock No. 611-17798, $.75, quantity discounts)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Role, *Collective Negotiation, Professional Recognition, *Public Education, Social Change, *Supervisors, Teacher Militancy

ABSTRACT

This pamphlet discusses the problems and complexities of supervisory workers caught in the middle management position. An attempt is made to identify the supervisors' role and to contribute to an understanding of the pressures that produce changes in the local school staff relationships. A brief history of negotiation among teachers is presented. A model of collective bargaining and professional negotiation contract language and content is included. (MF)

S

ED035080

The Supervisor's Role in Negotiation

by

Bernard W. Kinsella, Gordon J. Klopf,
Harold T. Shafer, and William F. Young

For the ASCD Commission
on Problems of Supervisors
and Curriculum Workers

Edited by William F. Young

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND
PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICRO-
FICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

EA 002 676

TO EA

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Copyright © 1969 by the
Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development, NEA

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

The materials printed herein are the expressions of the Commission. They do not represent endorsement by, nor a statement of policy of, the Association.

Price: $ .75
NEA Stock Number: 611-17798

Orders for fewer than three copies must be accompanied by payment. Discounts on quantity orders: 2-9 copies, 10%; 10 or more copies, 20%. Postage and handling will be charged on all orders not accompanied by payment.

Library of Congress
Catalog Card Number: 78-93287

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

Contents

Foreword **2**

Introduction: Progress and Problems **4**

Negotiation in the Private Sector **5**

Negotiation in Public Education **7**

Social Change Through Confrontation **8**

The Commission's Concern **10**

Dilemma of Supervisors **13**

Function of Supervision **16**

Proposals for Involvement of Supervisors **18**

Future Goals for the Profession **24**

Conclusion **26**

References **28**

Members of the Commission **29**

Foreword

THE use of mandatory negotiation as a legal means of solving many educational problems is today becoming increasingly evident on the national scene. Drastic changes caused by practices—some hurriedly developed—to meet the negotiation requirements in recent state laws have also produced a set of new professional problems. Moreover, teachers, administrators at all levels, Boards of Education, and the citizenry are hearing new words, new terms, and new slogans come into usage in the educational world.

Terms such as "disenfranchisement of the middle management workers," "labor-management adversary (we-they) relationships," "power struggle," "mediation and arbitration procedures," and "a community of interest," are now becoming common vocabulary items.

This publication addresses itself to the problems and complexities now consuming the attention of supervisory workers caught in "the middle management" position, not knowing where they stand or what their official status is in the (we-they) relationship. The writers of this booklet have tried to identify and to contribute to our understanding of the pressures producing changes in the local school staff relationships.

In the vanguard of the daily appearance of articles, news releases, professional booklets, bulletins, and books on aspects of negotiations, ASCD's Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers herein presents some timely and new concepts which hopefully will help in resisting further polarization or splintering of the educational family.

To counter the psychology created out of the turmoil, the Commission suggests several worthy and new concepts to be entertained as one tries to attain some objectivity.

1. Items of welfare, such as salaries, health insurance, and leave policies, should be dealt with apart from instructional program policies.

2. The term and spirit of "a community of purpose" rather than the popular term "a community of interest" (usually meaning self-interest) should counter the divisiveness now apparent in educational ranks.

3. The best instructional program should be produced through the cooperative deliberation of professionals representing a variety of roles in a school system.

4. Related to number three, is the concept that the local staff should explore and develop recommendations in the pre-negotiation period.

The Commission's Subcommittee on Negotiation, chaired by Bernard Kinsella, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Pittsford, New York, submits its statement to supervisory personnel across the nation hoping they will find it helpful in understanding the local as well as the national scene. William F. Young, Director for Administration and Communications, Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory, Detroit, Michigan, a member of the Commission, is to be commended for his incisive editing of the booklet.

HAROLD T. SHAFER, *Chairman*
ASCD Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers

Introduction: Progress and Problems

In many states the supervisors have been disenfranchised through negotiation. They are being labeled "middle management," a term used to describe their relative position in the organizational structure of a school system. Yet more important, the term represents the bind supervisors are in as a result of negotiation. Being "neither fish nor fowl" has too often resulted in supervisors' being left outside the negotiation arena—thus the dilemma.

Supervisors across the country are learning, to their dismay, that they are being moved into a position in which their expertise cannot be utilized properly; that they are not being given a voice in matters that affect them; that conditions conducive to hostilities between and among professional staff members are developing that they are not able to alleviate; that curriculum and curricular matters are being negotiated without their input; that their professional functions are being limited and restricted at the negotiation table; and that they are tending to gain less than teachers in economic matters dealing with salaries and fringe benefits.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and its Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers applaud the progress made through negotiation; yet they are very concerned about the negative ramifications of the negotiation process. The polarization phenomenon, resulting from negotiation, has created many problems for all professional staff members. Supervisors and curriculum workers, in particular, are being placed in a precarious position.

Supervisors and curriculum workers represent a critically important and neces-

sary segment of the profession. They are charged with the responsibility of providing leadership in the area of curriculum development and instructional improvement. They are either curriculum generalists or curriculum specialists and they have many different job titles.[1]

The Commission presents this document to help supervisors better understand the negotiation development; to provide insights and suggestions that will help them live more effectively with the development; and to propose some alternatives in an attempt to influence the future of negotiation in a positive direction. In order to accomplish these goals, it is necessary to provide some historical background data, as well as to analyze a new force in the change process. The present status and current trends of negotiation must be explored also with a close examination of the dilemma peculiar to supervisors. Some discussion of the function of supervision is also essential prior to the exploration of action proposals and future goals.

Negotiation in the Private Sector

The recent entry of negotiation in the public domain has grown out of, and is patterned after, the collective bargaining model that has developed in business and industry. We must look at the long history of negotiation in the private sector to better understand the relatively short history and present status of negotiation in public education.

[1] Supervisors and curriculum workers (hereafter referred to as supervisors) include principals, assistant principals, directors, coordinators, supervisors, consultants, assistant superintendents, associate superintendents, assistant directors, staff associates, curriculum advisers, and instructional assistants.

The practice of employee groups' organizing for collective action, a practice that is now accepted in our economic system, has a long history nationally and internationally. The trade guilds in Europe during the Medieval Period probably marked the beginning of labor unions as we know them today. In this country during the early 1800's there were some attempts by labor groups to act collectively for the purpose of promoting their interests. However, the courts ruled their actions illegal by concluding that such group activity was "criminal conspiracy." This legal interpretation was upheld until about the middle 1800's, when the Massachusetts Supreme Court ruled that the nature and purpose of group action could be illegal but not group action itself.

The next major problem that blocked the use of collective action in accomplishing the aims of labor unions was the Sherman Antitrust Act, which was passed in 1890. The courts supported employers and restrained labor unions by saying that the unions were restricting trade. The Clayton Act of 1914 was designed specifically to protect unions against the application of the antitrust law. In spite of this legislation, the Sherman Antitrust Act was still used to restrain unions until shortly after the enactment of the most important legislation in support of labor's right to organize and bargain collectively, the Wagner Act of 1935.

The Wagner Act, or the National Labor Relations Act, provided for the establishment of the National Labor Relations Board and affirmed labor's right to organize and bargain collectively. This legislation was tested at the level of the United States Supreme Court in 1937 and was found to be constitutional.

For many years now labor groups have been organized for the propose of promoting

their interests within the law. They have had the right to bargain collectively with employers in matters related to wages, hours, and working conditions. They have also had the right to strike, which has been their major weapon when bargaining has failed to produce the results they desired.

In this historical context, it is not difficult to understand why lawmakers in many states have passed laws to permit negotiation in the public sector patterned after the collective bargaining model. Legislators have given little or no attention to other alternatives such as a "legal model," or a "professional model." Teacher organizations have tended to behave as trade unions in an effort to achieve their goals. They are working with a model that has been tried, tested, and proven in business and industry. The collective bargaining model has achieved results—gains for labor unions.

Negotiation in Public Education

Negotiation in education has a very short history. It began in Norwalk, Connecticut, in 1946. A collective negotiation agreement was entered into by the teachers organization and the Norwalk Board of Education. In 1951, the courts supported the right of teachers to organize and stated that boards of education had the right to negotiate with teachers. About six years later the same teachers group reached a written agreement with the Norwalk Board of Education that provided the right for teachers to appeal for mediation of disputes. At this time the teachers were affiliated with the Connecticut Education Association. These developments in Connecticut did not receive broad coverage in the news media.

The disputes that did receive major national coverage were those between the

United Federation of Teachers and the New York City Board of Education between 1960-62. The New York teachers had the full support of the American Federation of Teachers. The National Education Association did not officially enter the negotiation picture until after the AFT's involvement in New York. In 1962, the NEA took formal action at its Representative Assembly Convention in Denver, Colorado. The NEA action was in support of teacher negotiation and resulted in a leadership commitment to the membership.

Since 1962, negotiation developments in education have been rapid as a result of the vigorous efforts of the AFT and the NEA; a growing impatience on the part of teachers; and the enabling legislation in many states, which has legalized teacher negotiation. The power struggle within the profession is between teachers, on the one hand, and boards of education and administration, on the other. Operationally, the laws and organizational behavior have tended to imitate the labor-management adversary relationship patterns found in business and industry.

State laws authorizing negotiation for teacher organizations are becoming quite common. In many states the laws on negotiation pertain exclusively to public school personnel. In other states, the laws are more general in that they apply to all public employees including public school personnel.

Social Change Through Confrontation

Educational institutions and many other institutions in our society have been characterized by arriving at solutions to problems through a very slow, deliberate

process, oftentimes inexcusably slow. Until recently, management's authority to establish organizational structures with the power vested only in the higher echelons of the structures, has perpetuated this slow process. Management's authority has been able to contain the pressures and implement changes when it was ready to do so. According to present signs, however, those times are gone forever.

Many groups and individuals in our society have become very impatient. They are no longer asking or requesting—they are demanding. The concept of confrontation has in recent years become very popular. Although this is not a new concept, its current application does reflect a new pattern of pressures producing recurring demands from different sources exhibiting a wide variety of issues. With many persons, the concept of confrontation has become a way of life, and utilization of the concept has achieved results, some desirable and some undesirable. The drive to bring about rapid change through various forced confrontation approaches has become a fairly common sociological pattern in American society today.

Negotiation behavior in education can be viewed as a part of this pattern. The new strong voice of the teacher and the new demands for shared power relationships are long overdue. For too many years, in too many instances, teachers have been the victims of tokenism. They had little to say about the decisions that affected them. Consequently, little progress was made in the areas of teacher salaries, fringe benefits, class size, instructional facilities, instructional equipment, instructional materials, and financial support for education.

The power teachers are gaining, in many instances, is right and proper. If we

are ever to become a profession, then the managers of the teacher-learning process must have a strong voice in all welfare and instructional matters that affect that process. However, it should be added that with progress come new problems. An analysis of what has happened clearly indicates that results have been both positive and negative.

Initially the major thrust by teachers, through the negotiation process, has been in the category of welfare and job security issues.[2] Generally speaking, significant gains have been made in most school districts involved in negotiation on most of these issues. For example, in Chicago and in New York City, salary and fringe benefit gains have been averaging more than $1,000 a year per employee affected. Gains on these issues have been needed for many years.

There is little quarrel with the teachers' right to present the issues and their newfound power to do something about the issues. A balance of power is an essential ingredient in the pursuit of professionalism. There also is little quarrel with the stated goals of teacher organizations. However, not all the results have been positive.

The Commission's Concern

The ASCD Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers has

[2] These issues typically have included salary schedules, salary increments, life insurance benefits, sick leave provisions, hospitalization insurance, maternity leave, military leave, personal business leave, family illness leave, sabbatical leave, leaves of absence, transfer rights, income protection, liability insurance, travel allowance, extra pay for extra duties, terminal leave or severance pay, tuition reimbursement, promotion opportunities, length of the teaching day, teaching assignments, duty-free lunch hours, duty-free planning periods, tax-sheltered annuities, the school calendar, teaching facilities, grievance procedures, payroll deductions, and released time.

serious reservations about the collective bargaining model being employed in the process, the fact that only a part of the total professional staff is involved, the nature of the items now being placed on the bargaining table, the detrimental effects on the instructional program, and the resultant negative impact on professional relationships. Although the gains have been significant, the costs have been high in terms of role relationships and the instructional program.

A basic premise of collective bargaining is the existence of a labor-management adversary relationship. Such a relationship promotes a "we-they" climate at a time when all professional staff members should be working cooperatively on the critical educational problems of today. This is a time when teachers and administrators should be sitting together having the freedom to explore, create, invent, and implement solutions to complex curricular problems.

Bargaining groups characteristically use the "community of interest" concept. This concept has too frequently been interpreted as meaning the same job classification, such as all teachers, for example, and/or it has been interpreted to mean all persons operating on the same salary schedule. In too many instances, such interpretations have excluded supervisors from negotiation and from membership in local educational associations.

The fragmentation of groups of staff members resulting from teachers' placing themselves in a separate bargaining unit has created a new type of hostility between and among staff members, has adversely affected communications, and has impeded cooperative efforts. The present trend appears to be to accept and perpetuate what is. In some districts there are splinter groups of

teachers, each with "a community of interest," each working for separate bargaining rights.

Administrators, too, have seized upon the community of interest concept. In some cases they have been recognized as separate bargaining groups while other administrative groups also are striving for recognition. The Hillsdale Case decision of 1969 may become a landmark for administrative groups. The ruling states that principals have a right, under the Michigan negotiation legislation, to organize and bargain collectively.

If the "me too" and the "bandwagon" approaches persist, we may have invented a monster that will devour all of us. We must, however, resist making a self-fulfilling prophecy. If we decide something is inevitable and act accordingly, the stage will be set to make it so. Just imagine what would happen if a local school district ultimately had separate bargaining units for classroom teachers, department chairmen, counselors, school social workers, librarians, nurses, coaches, driver education teachers, and elementary special (art, music, physical education) teachers. Then add to the picture elementary principals, secondary principals, assistant principals, supervisors, directors, coordinators, and consultants.

The ASCD Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers holds that it is ludicrous and ineffective for educators to work as splinter groups; the profession needs to coordinate and unify all its efforts. The profession needs to organize on the basis, not of a *community of interest,* but of a *community of purpose* concept. Professional staff members need to operate, not as labor-management, but as co-professionals. The profession needs to grow out of the collective bargaining model and grow

into (invent) a professional model. The profession needs to develop power relationships that are more consistent with and more adequate for the complex nature of the education enterprise. More about this will be said later.

Dilemma of Supervisors

Devoting special attention to the dilemma of supervisors should serve to illuminate the problems resulting from negotiation and should serve as a basis for recommending positive approaches. It is ironical that the essence of the negotiation concept, the hard-won right of teachers to be involved in decision making on matters that affect them, would be denied to supervisors by the implementation of that very concept.

This irony is compounded by the fact that supervisors have often been in the forefront demanding more involvement and power for teachers. They are in the "no-man's-land" of middle management. In many states, supervisors have been disenfranchised organizationally and thereby are not represented at the negotiation table. Yet master contract provisions are agreed upon that directly affect their daily leadership functions.

Illustrations of this point would include: the exclusive right of teachers to select instructional materials; a defined length of the school day that prohibits after-school meetings; the exclusive right of teacher organizations to select curriculum committee members; the adoption of new units of study or new courses in the curriculum at the "table" through negotiation; provisions that prohibit changes in the curriculum without prior approval of the teacher organization; restrictions on classroom visitations; teach-

ing assignments based upon teacher choice and seniority; summer school teaching positions based upon seniority; transfer regulations that are based upon seniority rather than qualifications; restrictions on evaluation activities; rigid class-size restrictions; and limitations on experimental and innovative programs. Contract provisions of this type tend to limit some functions of supervisors and at times to eliminate other functions, often denying the input of much-needed expertise. There is some reason to believe that in some instances teachers may inadvertently limit and restrict their own functions also through negotiation.

The power struggle in too many local school districts has resulted in dividing people into two camps: the teachers in one camp and top level administration, along with the board of education, in the other camp. The longer the collective bargaining model is used, the wider the gap between these two groups will become. Supervisors are in the middle. Their success is dependent upon working effectively with both groups. Choosing sides, if they actually have a choice, would not represent a positive contribution, nor would such choice enable them to carry out their responsibilities properly. This aspect of the dilemma has forced supervisors to work under a handicap that has made it more difficult for them to initiate and bring about instructional change.

Their lack of involvement in the negotiation process has also resulted in disproportionate economic growth for supervisors. In most settings, middle management people have not gained as much as teachers in regard to salary increases, fringe benefits, and job security. No legal channel is provided through which supervisors can speak about their unique welfare concerns. In many dis-

tricts the result has been that, due to a shortage of funds following teacher negotiation, supervisors are given less money than the teachers on a proportionate basis. Supervisors do not have a legal base from which to operate and they lack the strength of numbers.

Another major concern of supervisors, and of others who look objectively at the problem, relates to the impact of negotiation on children and young people and on the instructional program. Who negotiates for the pupils? When limited resources are available, the accomplishment of personal gains for teachers is achieved at the expense of the instructional program and of other human beings. Among these persons would be other professional staff members, members of the community, and the young people for whom schools are responsible.

Some negotiation demands that are commonly considered in the welfare category have implications for or direct effects upon curriculum and instruction. Should pupils not have some voice in matters that affect them? Should the community not have some voice? Do not all segments of our school communities have a moral right to be represented? It appears, then, that we are dealing not only with a dilemma of supervisors but with a dilemma of a larger society.

The "table problem" may not have been unique to the Paris Peace Talks. Currently negotiation in public education is characterized by a two-sided table, one side for the teachers and one side for the board-administration. Perhaps we need a five-sided table so that all segments of the school-community are properly represented. Then young people, parents, supervisors, teachers, and board-administration could sit and talk about mutual concerns, issues, and prob-

lems. We need to maintain or to increase selflessness in the process and to adopt a more responsible, comprehensive approach.

Function of Supervision

Beginning with the early history of the American school, the supervisory function has existed and has carried with it great responsibility. This function has usually included the determination of the design of the learning environment as well as the process of carrying out the design. This has meant knowing the fields of knowledge as well as ways of facilitating and enhancing children's learning through work with school personnel and the community. These dual functions of persons responsible for supervision have remained fairly consistent in the development of American education.

The element which has not remained consistent is the role and status of the individual who performs the supervisory functions. In many of the first schools in this country, supervision was accomplished by committees representing the community. As the function became centralized in a person, the individual carrying out the role began to assume a great deal of authority and power.

The authority and power held by individuals performing supervisory functions did not always mean that the supervised teachers were teaching more effectively; but in many cases, the use of such authority meant the imposition of controls on the teaching process and content. This control was executed in terms of the strengths, interests, convictions, inadequacies, and prejudices of the persons in the supervisory positions.

One of the constants in the history of supervision is that the function is so vital

that it is always performed by someone; somebody influences those who teach. The need and the function will always exist. Generally speaking, this has been a function performed by individuals in a variety of roles with different degrees of authority, power, and ability and with different interests and titles. In some instances the position has been held by individuals who themselves have not been learners or innovators, but maintainers of the status quo. Such persons perhaps have been better informed about the new content of education than about the process of education. The process here is critical. The people in supervisory roles must be adequate in their skill and knowledge of the processes of teaching teachers, of helping other adults assume new professional responsibilities and enhance their competencies.

In the past 25 years there have been major shifts in the ways individuals who performed supervisory functions were supposed to work. One of the major shifts has been toward a more democratic approach in the relationship between those in the supervisory role and the classroom teacher. Teachers became involved in the development of curriculum. Administrators and supervisors attempted to use shared leadership, consulting, and counseling skills. They also utilized a varied range of new designs for workshops, seminars, institutes, and even "happenings." In some areas of the nation their authority and power as specialists have been given to general administrators, with specialists' having to assume a consultant role.

With the new complexities and demands of the tremendous social revolution of the times, and with the school establishment being challenged to its very core, those

who are responsible for developing the content and process of education must meet these demands. New competencies and skills will be required of supervisors and new types of managerial roles will develop. One has only to look at the recent interest of organized management in the operation of schools, the teachers union, and parent and other community groups to realize that if the present establishment of supervisors does not respond, other sectors of society are ready to take over the supervisory leadership functions in American education.

The nature and the changing perceptions of the educative process, as well as the impact of negotiation, mandate that supervisors rethink their roles and staffing patterns. Also supervisors need to look at performing their functions of improving education through persuasion and leadership, rather than through exertion of power through authority.

Proposals for Involvement of Supervisors

As we view the dilemma of supervisors and the profession, we must look at two sets of approaches, one set of short-range proposals and one set of long-range goals. Conditions today cannot be wished away and we cannot pretend they do not exist. To get from where we are to where we should be will take time and effort. Supervisors have the potential of being influential in the process. Their leadership in this regard is badly needed.

The short-range proposals that are suggested are specifically designed to influence the current negotiation scene so that the negative ramifications can be reduced or eliminated. These proposals are also de-

signed to establish a position of influence and provide a voice for the supervisor in teacher-board negotiation. The proposals in this section should be viewed as idea generators and direction setters. They are presented with full knowledge that conditions and situations across the nation vary so much that what may be appropriate in one situation may be completely inappropriate in another.

Effort to influence negotiation content and processes must be exerted well in advance of the formal beginning of negotiation for a new contract. Such effort must be made at a time when emotions are not running high and a time when negotiators on both sides are apt to be most receptive to intelligent, logical, and positive proposals. It is also important to "reach" negotiators before "packages" and "counterproposals" are developed. Once statements are in writing and commitments have been made, it is extremely difficult to effect changes.

In settings where supervisors are outside the negotiation arena, it would be appropriate for them to submit formal action ideas designed to improve current negotiation practices. Implicit in the proposals presented here are the notions that curricular matters should not be subject to an adversary collective bargaining approach; that people who are to be affected by curriculum decisions should be involved in the decision-making process; that curriculum development is a growth and study process; that the end products of curriculum development activities evolve and are continually reconstructed; and that the best curriculum products result from the deliberations of professional people representing a variety of roles in a school district and with various backgrounds of experience.

The short-range proposals that might be helpful to supervisors are:

1. That a pre-negotiation workshop be established which would involve individuals representative of the total professional staff.

2. That the explicit purposes of the workshop be to open channels of communication and to discuss ways of improving the negotiation process.

3. That the pre-negotiation workshop concept, if successfully implemented, be established on a permanent basis for continuous, ongoing dialogue.

4. That legal negotiation between teachers and administration-board be restricted to problems and issues that are clearly in the teacher welfare category.

5. That a second negotiation group be established, involving representatives of the total professional staff, to deal with curriculum issues and problems.

6. That the curriculum negotiation group restrict its agreements to the process and design for seeking solutions.

7. That the curriculum negotiation agreements clearly specify who is to be involved, the decision-making procedures, realistic timetables for completion of tasks, time for staff members to work on the tasks, the controls necessary to ensure continued progress, and provisions for accountability.

8. That participation in *all* negotiation sessions be restricted to professional staff members. The temptation to involve "third parties" should be resisted. Local professional problems and issues should be resolved by local professional staff members.

Specific illustrations of contract language and content that could result from the implementation of the foregoing pro-

posals related to curriculum might be helpful at this point. Figure 1 (see page 22) presents a sampling of negotiation items that are curricular in nature; typical collective bargaining contract provisions on each item; and contract provisions that might result from a more professional approach consistent with the proposals that have been presented here.

The next set of proposals pertain exclusively to the relationships between supervisors and the administration-board:

1. That the administration-board establish an Advisory Council on Negotiation. This council should be representative of all members of the professional staff who are not represented by the teacher bargaining unit.

2. That the council meet regularly with the administration-board negotiating team for the purpose of reviewing teacher demands, reacting to the demands, offering suggestions, receiving progress reports on the conduct of negotiation, and receiving reports on agreements reached in negotiation.

3. That a group be established representative of all non-teaching professional staff members for the purpose of talking to the administration and the board about their welfare concerns.

4. That the purpose of this new group be to discuss problems professionally and to arrive at agreements—not to bargain collectively or to develop a master contract.

All of the proposals in this section can be implemented without legislative action in the states. Laws tell us what we must do, what we must not do, and what we may do. They do not tell us what we *should* do. The ASCD Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers views the proposals in this section as short-range ap-

FIGURE 1. Examples of Contract Language and Content—*Labor Model vs. Professional Model*

	COLLECTIVE BARGAINING MODEL	NEGOTIATION ITEM	PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION MODEL	
1	There shall be at least one teacher on each curriculum committee. All teacher committee members shall be appointed by the teacher bargaining unit. No new committees shall be established without consent of the bargaining unit.	Curriculum Committees	Curriculum development work is the responsibility of teachers and supervisors working together. All committee members are to be selected on the basis of interest and qualifications. All curriculum committees should have combined membership of teachers and supervisors. Committee appointments, coordination of committee activities, and the implementation of committee recommendations are the joint responsibility of the supervisory and teaching personnel.	1
2	Only teacher selected and approved textbooks will be purchased by the school district.	Textbooks	Criteria and procedures for the selection of textbooks and other instructional materials are to be developed by a committee of teachers and supervisors, and approved by the superintendent. Each textbook selection committee will have a supervisory staff member represented.	2

3	No class in the school district shall exceed a maximum enrollment of thirty (30) students.	Class Size	The guideline for each school will be an overall class size average of twenty-eight (28). Class size adjustments will be possible based upon data related to level of instruction, nature of the content, nature of the total program, nature of the community, type and condition of facilities, school enrollment, and distribution of students by grade level.	3
4	The length of the teacher's work day shall be from 8:45 a.m. until 3:45 p.m. Teachers will not be required to attend after-school meetings unless they are given extra pay.	Length of School Day	The length of a teacher's day cannot be circumscribed by hours. The length of each day relates to completion of professional responsibilities and should be flexible. Teachers are to be available for supervision of students before and after school, for faculty meetings, committee meetings, conferences, and attendance at an agreed-upon number of school activities.	4

proaches and presents these in the hope that they will be of some immediate help to supervisors.

Future Goals for the Profession

The major concern of the ASCD Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers is the future of education and the future of our profession. Repetition at this point seems appropriate. The profession needs, not to work as splinter groups, but to coordinate and unify all its efforts. The profession needs to organize on the basis, not of community of interest, but of community of purpose. Professional staff members need to operate, not as labor-management, but as co-professionals. The profession needs to develop power relationships that are more consistent with and more adequate for the complex nature of the education process. The profession needs to grow out of the collective bargaining model and to grow into a professional model.

A professional negotiation model would have the potential of contributing to a new kind of cooperation between and among *all* professional staff members. Such a model could help in the coordination of efforts among the various segments of the profession, and thus lead to its unification. The complexity of the education enterprise requires differentiation of roles, functions, training, and compensation. The need for special groups to organize and to have an identity cannot be denied. These groups will have special interests and special problems. The realities must be recognized as we talk about the goal of a unified profession. The term, unified profession, is not being used in the context of mandatory membership, but rather relates to the quality of

relationships and the pursuit of common goals.

The achievement of the qualitative concept of a unified profession would result from recognition of differences, respect for differences, and the establishment of procedures for resolving conflicts in constructive ways. Professional staff members would be talking to, with, and for one another. They would deal with one another fairly and justly. They would assume joint responsibility for the conduct of members of the profession. They would no longer say, "That's *your* problem"; they would say, "That's *our* problem." They would have a strong voice in relation to school finance and educational legislation. They would assume responsibility for and be held accountable for their negotiation proposals.

Our task is to determine creative ways to achieve such lofty goals. Too often we feel that we must "invent the wheel" all over again. Educators in this country can learn much from experiences that led to the present status of the American Medical Association. Within our own field we can look to those experiences that aided Canadian, and other British Commonwealth educators, in the accomplishment of their unified profession concept.

The implementation of some controls over the content and process of negotiation through legal provisions might also be helpful, or at least worth exploring. New administrative staffing patterns that would assure full participation of teachers in all instructional decisions certainly would contribute to improving our profession. Experimentation with alternative models for negotiation might prove highly productive. These suggestions should be viewed as clues to new approaches rather than as recommendations for change. The best answers

to our problems do not appear to be available at this time; we are still in the brainstorming and learning stage relative to the achievement of a more unified profession.

Conclusion

In this paper the ASCD Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers has attempted to treat the subject of negotiation in a comprehensive manner, giving special attention to the present plight of supervisors. The brief historical review of collective bargaining in the private sector should help supervisors better understand the current status of negotiation in the public sector. The comparatively short history of negotiation in education clearly indicates that the collective bargaining model is being implemented in many states across the nation. The fact that teacher groups have become very impatient with the change process in education has led to strong militant behavior on the part of many teacher organizations.

The gains teachers have made on welfare issues are commendable. Their legal right to be actively involved in all matters that affect them has excellent potential for improving education and fostering better professional relationships. However, this potential has not been realized because of the utilization of the collective bargaining model and the "we-they" climate that has developed. Too often supervisors are excluded from the negotiation process. This has had a negative impact on supervisors in regard to status, functions, and working relationships with other staff members.

The review of the function of supervision in education clearly supports the fact that the performance of supervisory func-

tions is more important than ever before in American education. It is also clear that supervisors must reassess the nature of their functions and the procedures they employ in carrying out their functions. A review of staffing patterns would be a necessary element in the reassessment process. The action proposals presented in this paper have been designed as suggested approaches supervisors might use in local districts to improve current negotiation practice and provide a voice for themselves in the process. The specifics of the proposals can and should be readily adapted and improved. The assumptions implicit in the proposals and the intended results of the proposals are the important elements.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and its Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers have attempted here to recognize the urgent need to deal with the realities supervisors face today. At the same time we must also look down the road in terms of the best educational society we can visualize 10 or 15 years from now. The long-range goal must be the more unified profession that can result from the invention and implementation of a professional negotiation model.

ASCD and the Commission view the present negative developments in negotiation as a critical area of concern. This concern will remain a priority of the Association in the future. Efforts at the national level will continue in the direction of influencing all professional associations toward improved communications, agreement on common goals, and greater unification of effort.

References

Roy B. Allen and John Schmid, editors. *Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration.* Fayetteville, Arkansas: University of Arkansas, College of Education, and the University Council of Educational Administration, 1966.

Charles Cogen. "Collective Bargaining: The AFT Way." Speech given at National Institute on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, Rhode Island College, July 8, 1965. Chicago: American Federation of Teachers, 1965.

Ronald O. Daly. "New Directions for Professional Negotiation." *National Education Association Journal* 55(7):27-29; October 1966.

F. Keppel. "Use Strike Only as Last Resort, Keppel Urges AFT Members." *Nation's Schools* 76:92; October 1965.

Charles T. Schmidt, Jr., Hyman Parker, and Bob Repas. *A Guide to Collective Negotiations in Education.* East Lansing, Michigan: Social Science Research Bureau, Michigan State University, 1967.

Joseph Shister, Benjamin Aaron, and Clyde W. Summers. *Public Policy and Collective Bargaining.* New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

T. M. Stinnett, Jack H. Kleinmann, and Martha L. Ware. *Professional Negotiation in Public Education.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Members of the ASCD Commission on Problems of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers

HAROLD T. SHAFER, *Chairman*—Superintendent, Wyckoff Township Public Schools, Wyckoff, New Jersey.

ROBERT J. ALFONSO—Assistant Dean for Instruction and Graduate Studies, College of Education, Kent State University, Ohio

MRS. MARION C. BECKWITH—Assistant Director, Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development, Montgomery County Schools, Rockville, Maryland

LEO BLACK—Assistant Commissioner, Colorado State Department of Education, Denver

GERALD R. FIRTH—Chairman of the Department of Secondary Education, University of Alabama, University

JOHN FORTENBERRY—Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Little Rock Public Schools, Little Rock, Arkansas

BEN M. HARRIS—Associate Professor of Education, University of Texas, Austin

BARBARA HARTSIG—Director, Elementary Education, California State College, Fullerton

BERNARD W. KINSELLA—Assistant Superintendent, Pittsford Central Schools, New York

GORDON J. KLOPF—Dean of Faculties, Bank Street College of Education, New York, New York

JOHN T. LOVELL—Dean, School of Education, University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Connecticut

WILLIAM H. LUCIO—Professor of Education, University of California, Los Angeles

KENT MEYERS—Assistant Superintendent, Lake Oswego Public Schools, Lake Oswego, Oregon

JOHN PRATER—Superintendent, Maywood Public Schools, Maywood, Illinois

J. T. SANDEFUR—Chairman of the Division of Education, Division of Teacher Education, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia

WILLIAM F. YOUNG—Director for Information and Communication, Michigan-Ohio Regional Educational Laboratory, Detroit